

To: Novak, Paul[Paul.Novak@epa.state.oh.us]; Nygaard, Eric[eric.nygaard@epa.state.oh.us]
Cc: Pierard, Kevin[pierard.kevin@epa.gov]; Yedavalli, Sreedevi[yedavalli.sreedevi@epa.gov]
From: Kuefler, Patrick
Sent: Tue 1/21/2014 2:17:51 PM
Subject: FW: FY14 Proposed Permit Review List OH
Hanlon Memo 316(a) 2008 10 28 (2).pdf
OH - Permits for Review.xlsx

Paul and Eric – What is the status of the Hamilton County permits? There are three on our review list. We received one Muddy Creek but not the other two. I understand that they might be out in draft. It is important that they get sent to us in the manner requested in our attached message from October. In addition, when the post public notice proposed permit is sent to EPA, it must also be sent the r5npdes mail box and Sreedevi as requested, not just the presumed permit reviewer. Please let me know if you have any questions and the status of the Hamilton County permits. thanks

From: Kuefler, Patrick
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2013 4:37 PM
To: 'Novak, Paul'; Nygaard, Eric
Cc: Pierard, Kevin; Opie, Jodie; Yedavalli, Sreedevi
Subject: FY14 Proposed Permit Review List OH

Attached are the lists of **expired or expiring individual permits that Region proposes to review during FY'14**. We also seek to review any NPDES general permits developed in FY14. We may not have listed all the general permits on the attached tables. If you have any questions, see mistakes, or want to discuss modifications to the list, please contact me.

For each of the permits selected for review, to the extent possible, please **provide searchable electronic versions** of the following documents. **Please send them to our new centralized email account at r5npdes@epa.gov and Sreedevi Yedavalli:**

1. Previous final permit including any modifications;
2. The draft permit;
3. Permit application;
4. The Fact Sheet;
5. The public notice (depending at what stage the permit is in);
6. Any other state specific documents that you normally include or would be needed to understand the basis for effluent limitations and conditions in the permit (example: Illinois–

water quality based effluent limits memo); and

7. EPA's IG issued a report on 316(a) alternate thermal limitations in NPDES permits. The only major deficiency identified was that permit public notices were not consistent with federal regulations at 40 CFR 124.57. Review of 316(a) limitations has been a regional priority as many 316(a) demonstrations have not been reviewed since the original submission and approval often dating back to the 1970's. Region 5 States should submit all draft permits with 316(a) alternate thermal limitations **prior to public notice** so that the Region can review the 316(a) limitations and the accompanying public notice for consistency with federal requirements (see attached 2008 Hanlon 316(a) memo).

While these are new permits for FY14, we will continue to follow up on those that we have already reviewed or are reviewing in FY12 and FY13 through final issuance. If we have reviewed a draft permit, we also expect to receive the post – public notice proposed permit along with any comments received during the notice period to close out our review. We are also interested in any appeals of permits that we have reviewed.

Finally, while we have put in a good faith effort to identify all the permits that we would like to review this FY, we reserve the right to review additional permits as needed to address issues that come up during the year such as Congressional or interstate interest. We will adhere to the review time periods identified in our MOA and will consider them to start when we receive the complete review package.

We look forward to working with you as you issue great permits. Please e-mail or give me a call if you have any questions.

Patrick Kuefler

Chief, Section 1

NPDES Programs Branch

312 353-6268